

# The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of The Daily Tar Heel are expressed on its editorial page. All unsigned editorials are the opinions of the editor and the staff. Letters and columns represent only the opinions of the individual contributors.

Friday, February 12, 1971  
Tom Gooding, Editor

## Student involvement needed in decisions

The Student Stores, working with the University attorney, has instituted a policy of issuing warrants for bad checks.

The warrants have resulted in several students spending the night in jail because they couldn't raise \$100 bail.

There certainly can be no question of legality concerning the action. In fact, we would hope those who knowingly and persistently pass bad checks would be called into account for their action.

However, we feel the manner in

which the policy was begun is indeed unfortunate.

The policy does break precedent. Student Stores manager Tom Shetley said this is the first time he knows of warrants issued against students for writing bad checks.

Mr. Shetley points out that there has been a rash of bad checks passed recently.

Unfortunately, in an effort to correct the situation Shetley went to "the proper administrative officials" rather than carrying the problem to the Faculty Student Stores Committee.

The administration has long praised the factor of student involvement in policy decisions. As recently as Thursday Assistant to the Chancellor Claiborne Jones spoke in favor of increasing the students' role in the decision making process.

If we are to believe the administration is sincere we must question why the decision was made without any student input. J.A. Branch, executive director of University enterprises and services, said the issuing of the warrants was a management decision and advice was not called for by the committee.

If the advice had been to follow an existing University policy of holding grades or diplomas for overdue accounts we would agree.

However, this was a serious departure from previous policies.

We feel the decision was a drastic overreaction that could have been prevented if the University had honored their promises about student involvement.

John Dixon

# Nixon intends no end to war

(Editor's note: The writer, John Dixon, is a professor of religion and art at UNC.)

Last Spring I issued a challenge to the faculty. The challenge was not taken. I now make another.

At that time I proposed that the faculty seek appropriate political action to try to bring the Indo-China war to an end. There was eloquent opposition to this kind of act. My challenge was this: the students need and deserve our leadership; if what I proposed was unacceptable, the faculty was morally responsible to produce something better. The proposal was judged unacceptable. The faculty then passed a motion that was little more than an affirmation of approval of what the students were doing. After that—nothing. Nothing whatsoever.

The crisis is on us again. It is perhaps not so immediate and dramatic this time but it is all the more imperative that the presumed gifts of intellectuals—reflective thought—be applied to the situation before it gets again to the point it reached last spring.

It is now clear both by act and official statement that the Nixon administration intends no end to the Indo-China War other than military victory.

The protests of the spring had effect: it forced the aborting of the Cambodian invasion and compelled the President to commit himself irrevocably to the withdrawal of ground troops. But the President has now made it plain that the prestige and resources of this country are committed to the present regimes in Indo-China, that he feels free to keep up to 100,000 air and support troops in Vietnam as long as necessary to ensure the victory of the South Vietnamese.

The President has offered the American people a devil's bargain. "I will stop killing Americans if you will leave me free to kill as many Asians as I think necessary." The hell of it, the literal, damnable hell of it, is that the American people show every sign of accepting the bargain.

Air wars only kill people. No war was ever won by air power; after years of ferocious pounding German aircraft production was increasing. Air power can only destroy and kill; it cannot win. To accept the President's bargain is to condemn thousands, perhaps millions of people to misery, mutilation and death.

Back when there was a sense of morality, especially about other people's conduct, the conscience of the world was outraged by the destruction of Lidice by the Nazis. The American Army and Air Force have destroyed so many people that it is past classifying with simple barbarities like Lidice; it is approaching the class of the Nazi extermination of the Jews.

It is no good saying that each individual is free to make his personal protest as a citizen; the forces committed to this killing, those who profit in pride or cash, are so many, so strong, so skillfully devious that only the strongest institutional action can hope to do the job. Except under pressure, the Congress clearly will not. The churches, with a few shining individual exceptions, are either supine or actively in support of the war, in the voice of cardinals and evangelists. Business and labor are helplessly divided, the judiciary evades the issue. If the universities do not act there will be no one, no institution, to stop the killing and return us to something like moral integrity.

We are not equipped, by precedent, training or disposition, to act either as conscience or as leaders of a nation. But if we don't, no one else will. If we don't, we make a mockery of all our professed ideals.

It is no good saying the university must remain non-political. I would be happy to debate this in academic terms but this occasion does not permit such luxury, so I will simply assert: universities were founded to serve a political and social function. They are saturated with politics. They are indispensable agents of the political order.

This is not something bad. I would not have it different. Indeed, I do not know of any other way to have a university. We can pretend it is not so because we are such willing supporters of the existing order that we don't get into trouble for our political acts. We have eased our conscience for this subservience to the existing order because that order has been as just and decent and humane as is reasonable to expect from political systems managed by men and certainly within limits that permit orderly disagreement without institutional unity.

That luxury is now denied us. The administration of our government is now committed to a policy so murderous, so destructive, so subversive of every ideal the country professes, that to refuse to stand against it is to be guilty of complicity with it.

Let us not delude ourselves about our political involvement. It is our techniques they use, our ideas they exploit. We have trained the people who run that machine. It is everywhere our facilities they have used. We have for generations taught approval of the system that has produced this war.

Let us not delude ourselves about our responsibility. What meaning is there in our professed dedication to abstract truth, when truth is defined for the American people by a presidential press conference? Who can be impressed by our affirmations of intellectual ideals when our chief instrument—words—is debased as the Secretary of Defense debases it?

What weight should be given to our professions of allegiance to the purity and

objectivity of scholarship when we sit silently and let the facts be concealed or distorted? Of what respect is a scholarship that costs us nothing and secures our comfort? Of what respect is an objectivity applied only to the remote, the esoteric and the inconsequential?

When the institutions of democracy are being used to such purposes is it the duty of the university to sit on the sideline and keep the chronicle? Should it comfort a Cambodian whose family is buried in the rubble of his village that someday he will be a foot-note in a Ph.D. dissertation in the History Department?

Large areas of Laos are in ruins and the survivors of American terror live in caves. Can we really be content to know that some day one of our historians will record that on such a month 44 villages were destroyed rather than 38 as the press so dutifully reported? Our anthropologists might regret the destruction of ancient village culture; should we rejoice that our psychologists will have a rich harvest of psychic disorder resulting from the violent obliteration of all a people believe in? The Religion Department might have a dissertation topic such as "The Consequences of Aerial Destruction on Buddhism in Hue, 1968-69." Is this really what devotion to truth is all about? Do we honor Socrates by seminars on his epistemology or by knowing in our gut, not just in scholarly memory, that he died rather than submit to tyrannical purpose?

Is Erasmus honored by the presence of his books on our reading list? Is Camus no more than an interesting novelist and essayist? Was Thomas Jefferson an item for scholarly treatises or was he a serious man?

Did Abraham Lincoln understand American purposes, or does Spiro Agnew? What was once the last, best hope of earth is now the ally of dictators and a machine for the systematic destruction of Asians.

A reporter finally left Vietnam because he couldn't stand it any longer. He had gone into a Cambodian village shortly after the American Air Force had been over it. He saw, in the square of a ruined village, five people, a man, a woman, three children, "fused" into one mass by American napalm. When such things are done who can be silent? Is a university a guardian of truth or a servant of tyrants?

So my challenge is to answer these things. That we must act I do not doubt. That we are required by professional honor to defend the ideals we have so luxuriously claimed for ourselves I also do not doubt. That the reprisal may be savage is possible; we deal with cruel men. (For comfort I might add that they are also petty men and we might even succeed in being faithful to our principles without it costing very much.)

What we should and can effectively do should be corporately determined and my

sense of moral imperative to act does not necessarily include an equal imperative to act my way. I see certain things possible to us.

We are under moral obligation to use whatever professional talents we have. Perhaps the central of these is less a talent than a claim—the claim to devotion to truth. We have our pretensions and our flattery and are not entitled to improve the ordinary flattery of politicians. But this is beyond the ordinary: official lies are concealing ruthless killing and are no longer to be borne on pain of our impeachment. Historians are concerned properly with the intricate forces of human conduct. The definition is not just past human conduct. Should our political scientists and our lawyers watch idly the corruption of our institutions of a great religion are debauched by the kind of self-indulgent Christianity preached by Billy Graham in the White House? Do our sociologists have no responsibility when agencies they have advised destroy the social structure of an ancient people? Can our anthropologists keep silent when they see the systematic destruction of ancient cultures?

The list could be longer. In truth, barely any on this faculty are free from direct responsibility; either their disciplines are being used as a tool of destruction or their discipline is itself a tool of truth and to withhold its use from the proclamation of truth is to be accessory to falsehood. A decent humility in awareness of our own limitations and a decent tolerance of other men has kept us heretofore in a humane balance of relationship to the governing authorities of the nation. We have provided them the use of our skills and trained their agents (all for comfortable fees) without claiming the right to speak corporately to the use made of these things. That clam indulgence is no longer available to us. We can no longer face our students and claim devotion to truth, to honor, to patriotism so long as the country's power is being used as it now is.

If we do not act we not only have responsibility for complicity by consent and cooperation with what is now being done in Indo-China. We will bear responsibility for leaving our students no choice other than their present exhausted and cynical apathy or violent rebellion. Students have taken the only concerted moral and patriotic stand against this war but students are ill equipped to sustain a long campaign, particularly against the skilled and ruthless deviousness of the administration. The burden of leadership could have fallen on groups more skilled and experienced than we are but I see no one else laying claim to it. If we don't do it, no one will. And if we don't do it, our rhetoric of truth and honor is no more than concealment for the killing of an endless line of Asian peasants.

John W. Dixon, Jr.  
Professor of Religion and Art

## The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom

Tom Gooding, Editor

Rod Waldorf ..... Managing Ed.  
Mike Parnell ..... News Editor  
Rick Gray ..... Associate Ed.  
Harry Bryan ..... Associate Ed.  
Chris Cobbs ..... Sports Editor  
Frank Parrish ..... Feature Editor  
Ken Ripley ..... National News Ed.  
John Gellman ..... Photo Editor  
Terry Cheek ..... Night Editor

Robert Wilson ..... Business Mgr.  
Janet Bernstein ..... Adv. Mgr.



## Letters to the editor

### Proctor argument fallacious

To The Editor:  
I would like to comment briefly upon what I consider a fallacious argument in Mr. Grover Proctor's February 3 editorial entitled "Dogmatism May Be Downfall of America." Grover contends that for whatever the Nixon Administration "can be accused of doing or not doing... no one can in any sense say that Nixon or his staff has been responsible for the widening rift we are finding in America. It started long before Nixon and unless checked it will last long after his term(s) in office. A President cannot serve nor should he be expected to, the interests of all groups and factions 100 per cent of the time. Right or wrong, our system allows for the choice of the largest group of people to head the government."  
Yes, Grover, the division in our country started long before President Nixon took office. But when Mr. Nixon assumed that office, he entered on the theme of "Bring Us Together." Unfortunately, I think the President for the most part has ignored this theme since assuming the duties of the Chief Executive. In fact, in my opinion, Mr. Nixon has pursued certain policies that have insured further division in our nation. A case in point is the 1970 Congressional elections. I personally hold the President responsible for the direction

of a bitter and divisive campaign, a "law and order" campaign that should have been directed at organized crime rather than college students, a "faction" which the President and his staff have frequently attacked.

No, Grover, "A President cannot serve... the interests of all groups and factions 100 per cent of the time." Certainly a President and any other politician makes many political promises to many group interests which he cannot always keep. I am quite aware that Mr. Nixon is a politician and party leader as well as the President of the United States. But I am sure that no one will disagree with the idea that the Presidency should take precedence over any party position. "Bring Us Together" is not a political promise. It is a principle, a very noble one, to which President Nixon supposedly adhered during the 1968 campaign, but one which has apparently suffered oblivion since Mr. Nixon assumed office. Instead, Mr. Nixon desecrated the Office of the Presidency through his repulsive personal conduct during the 1970 Congressional campaign.

The President has a responsibility to all of the American people (an idea which Mr. Nixon is fond of quoting), for the Office of the Presidency is without doubt one of the most powerful symbols of

American democracy, a democracy based upon majority rule and minority rights. Since this office is such a symbol, the President must in some sense be above the influence of selfish interests. A President must be a speaker for all Americans who believe in the idea of democracy, whether or not those Americans voted for that President. In this critical unifying aspect, I, unlike you, Grover, believe President Nixon has failed disastrously.

Fred Davenport  
211 Ruffin

## To the students:

### don't you wish?

To the Editor:  
To the student body, especially those who are even dimly aware of the existence of SG, Stupid Government: Now don't you wish you'd elected me in '69 and Daughtry last year?

Suckers. Heh, heh.  
Tim Knowlton  
269 Harvard Street  
Cambridge, Mass.

Rick Gray

# Vietnamization only means changing uniforms

Richard Nixon owns the war now. It all belongs to him—South Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos and whatever is next on his list.

America, it seems, is still holding on to her dream. She is the way, the truth and the light.

The world needs to be saved, and Richard Nixon and his America are the new messiah.

In this new religion we will be content to play the role of Judas.

A scant two weeks ago we were told the combat role of the Green Berets in Vietnam was over. They were all being brought back home to Ft. Bragg.

Well, according to CBS News, all Green Beret units are out of Vietnam.

They are fighting in Laos. And they are wearing South Vietnamese uniforms.

For some reason we find it a bit hard to believe that all of the Green Berets who were in Vietnam suddenly decided to change their citizenship.

For some reason, the longer we listen to any of the politicians the harder we find it to believe anything they say.

And our disbelief has lulled us to sleep. We've stopped listening to anyone. The war has become so hated that it is hard to read or listen to news reports.

We tried to end it by working for Gene, but we lost in the streets of Chicago.

We tried to end it by marching to Washington in November, 1969, but we lost out to a football game.

We tried again last spring, and we lost because they only said they heard us.

Fight it through the system they keep saying. The system is made to respond to the needs of the people.

To that, we say this: The system is made only for those who hold the power.

The system is corrupt. It perpetuates the corruption and does nothing to cleanse itself.

The system still believes it must have a New Frontier to survive, and it is the frontier which is destroying life while keeping the system alive.

There are no options left. Everything

has been tried, and everything has failed.

They refuse to count our votes.

They ignore our demonstrations.

They throw our petitions in the wastebasket.

Our chants fall on deaf ears.

Peace is a word that to them does not exist. Nixon and his Gestapo and his Creighton Abrams and William Westmoreland and John Mitchell and Herbert Hoover and Spiro Agnew have no idea what that word means.

Without the war, business would slump, the military would be out of a job and we could do something about the starving people in the ghettos of Washington, D.C., and the delta of the Mississippi River.

Without the war this nation could fulfill the American Dream as it should be fulfilled.

But the Manifest Destiny of the Great White Hope has taken over our dream. Nixon has taken our dream, the dream of Jefferson, Lincoln, McCarthy and Robert Kennedy, and turned it into a nightmare.

And the only way out of the nightmare is to wake up and pop the bubble.

To end a nightmare we only need awaken, we only need realize that it is a nightmare, that is destroying all of us.

Vietnam is the racism of America, the pollution, the oppression, the persecution of those who refuse to believe the

Doublethink or listen to the Doublespeak.

Richard Nixon has not ended the war. He has expanded it. He has betrayed the American people. He gave some of them a dream, and he has taken it away.

Vietnamization of the war no longer means letting the repressive Saigon government fight its own counter-revolution.

It now means putting American troops in Vietnamese uniforms and calling that Vietnamization.

Nixon has taken the war for his own. It is his toy now, and we don't want to play with his toys anymore.

And his sandbox has become a dungheap.